



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Election of 1852 *

BY DALE BEELER, Vice Consul to Rome.

VI THE STATE CAMPAIGN

The candidates on the State ticket filled long schedules of joint political meetings in all parts of the State and from early in the spring until a short time before the election. Messrs. Wright and McCarty, candidates for governor, and Messrs. Willard and Williams, candidates for lieutenant-governor, and others of the leading office-seekers had extended itineraries during most of the campaign. The newspapers seldom reported in full any of the speeches, but always commented on them. A great part was taken in the campaign by the editors who waged an incessant warfare against their political opponents, always seeking to embroil in the general conflict any man who showed signs of fight. One side endeavored to put the other in a hole by digging up some particularly unsavory act in a candidate's past record.

In the campaign of 1852, as in nearly every State campaign since, the candidates pleaded the "farmer" story, pretending a great love and affection for and interest in that body of the citizenship, in order to get the farmers' votes. The leading newspapers of each party engaged, during the campaign, in a controversy as to the early life of their candidates for governor, each trying to make out the strongest case for its own man that he was or had been a farmer, and thus making him eminently qualified to represent the interests of the farmers. This was a necessary qualification for a good candidate for governor. The truth in this case was that neither Wright nor McCarty had ever been a farmer long enough to get the name. McCarty had worked a few months when a young man, while Wright's only claim lay in the fact that he had been a mechanic who worked on farming implements. The fact that while he was governor, he had spoken at several agricultural meetings and at various county fairs, appeared to give the governor the strongest case.

*Concluded from last number.

The *Indiana State Journal* labored long and industriously to manufacture campaign thunder from some of Governor Wright's fervid and over-eloquent protestations of love for Democracy's principles. Daily from March 1 until election day, it gave prominence in its columns to the following words, which Governor Wright had uttered at the time of the State Convention:

"Whigs! Remember that Joseph A. Wright emphatically twice declared, on accepting the nomination of the Democratic Convention, that 'he had rather fall with his political friends than rise with the aid of his political opponents.'" ⁴¹

The Democratic press answered this by saying that the *State Journal* inserted the words "the aid of," that Governor Wright did not say them; and further, that what he meant was that "he would rather fall fighting with his friends for his cherished principles, than rise with his opponents, by the sacrifice of any of those principles." ⁴²

The Whig papers were not in the least averse to going into Governor Wright's past record to gather utterances of his which might be converted to useful campaign ammunition. The *State Journal* and the *Madison Banner*, both Whig, attacked the governor for his speech at a fair in Cincinnati in 1851, during the heat of the slavery agitation, in which he had said that "all the members of Congress from Indiana, who supported the compromise measures, had misrepresented their constituents and would be defeated if they were candidates for re-election" and "that Indiana would never execute the fugitive slave law." At this time, in 1852, Governor Wright and his party stood for that measure, and now the Whig press was calling upon him to explain the inconsistency of his attitude. Governor Wright was never strong pro-slavery, rather he was more of a Free Soiler. His views as he expressed them on that occasion, are explainable when it is remembered that he expressed the real sentiments of most Indianians at that time when the free men's passions were inflamed by the slavery agitation. The governor was no more inconsistent than many of the Whigs.

The Democratic press refrained from attacking Mr. McCarty to any extent. It may have been because he was commonly recognized as a weak candidate. His career as a noteshaver in connection with the Indianapolis Land Office several years before would have made good campaign material but for the fact that the business seems

⁴¹ *Indiana State Journal*, March 1, 1852.

⁴² *Logansport Democratic Pharos*, May 12, 1852.

to have been a bi-partisan game, with a prominent Democratic leader involved. It would have been as bad for one party as for the other if this subject had been thoroughly aired.

The death of Henry Clay on June 29, 1852, gave the Whig press cause for another sally against Governor Wright's record. This time an attempt was made to get campaign capital from the inconsistency of Wright's criticism of Clay during the campaign of 1844 and his expressions of respect, after Clay's death, for the greatness of the Kentucky Statesman. The *Indiana State Journal* called the Governor a slanderer of Clay for pronouncing hypocritical eulogies. It gave voice to its power of villification in the following words:

"Among all the lean, gaunt, and vindictive blood-hounds, that were ever unleashed from the kennel of Locofocoism, and for years pursued Mr. Clay with slander and detraction, Joseph A. Wright was among the foremost. In 1844, he denounced Mr. Clay as a blackleg, a Sabbath-breaker, and a murderer, declaring with most sanctimonious face, and with up-turned eyes, that the 'blood of poor Cilley (killed in a duel) was upon his hands.'"⁴³

The *State Sentinel* replied that the above article in its length and breadth, was wilfully and maliciously false, and that John D. De-frees, the author, knew it was false when he uttered and published it; that the *Journal* men were soulless villifiers, by whose policy of blackguardism it would never allow itself to be driven from position. These editorials were mere newspaper squabble and had little influence on the voters. The editor of the *State Journal* was more eager to break down the Democrats than to work for the election of General Scott and the Whig ticket. Such an attitude only shows their unconcern as to the outcome of the election. Editor Clarkson of the Brookville *American*, said that neither Scott nor Pierce represented any moral issue and he was perfectly indifferent as to the result of the election. Parker, the only Whig member of Congress from this State, repudiated the Whig platform and ticket.

The Logansport *Democratic Pharos* also indulged in the practice of comparing the lives and records of the Democratic and Whig candidates for governor. As for McCarty, it said that the Whigs talk about that honest, plain, unassuming man as though the article of honesty were a rare commodity at least among the Whigs. Then the *Pharos* tells what an honest, industrious young man Governor

⁴³ *Indiana State Sentinel*, Aug. 30, 1852.

Wright was in his youth, about his life as a student at Indiana University, where, during his attendance, he acted as janitor and door-keeper at that institution, earning, by chopping wood and other services usually considered menial, the means of subsistence while in Bloomington during his college course. The *Sentinel* asserted that the President of the Board of Trustees of Indiana University was the authority for the statement about Wright.

Governor Wright entered the campaign early in April. He usually spoke on some phase of State finances, occasionally changing to the tariff and the subtreasury system when he wished to speak on national issues. He claimed for the Democrats the credit for the redemption of the State from Whig indebtedness and he never failed to extol the wisdom of the sale of the State's interest in the Madison and Indianapolis Railway, a deal which seems to have been engineered by politicians in both parties. The reduction of the State debt which in 1843, following the financial stringency, amounted to near \$15,000,000, which he had reduced by one-half—by repudiation, some said—was one of Governor Wright's main sources of campaign argument. In a speech made on one of the joint tours with McCarty, he said: "What is now the condition of the State? About one-half of the State debt discharged, and the interest on the balance promptly paid. The credit of the State is good at home and abroad; and the sun rises this day upon a million of her children prosperous and happy. Are not these things so? And by whose policy has this change been produced? There is no man in Indiana, who knows her history but that will, in the honest conviction of his heart, say it was the Democratic policy that has redeemed our fallen State."⁴⁴ About one-half of the State debt was cancelled by the Butler Bill of 1846 and its amendment of 1847, according to which the old canal was given to the bondholders for one-half of the bonds.

Nicholas McCarty had been a merchant most of his life and therefore was not very well versed in the arts and tricks of the political campaigning. He was a plain, unassuming man, so plain, in fact, that he never made a hit with his audience by displaying his oratorical powers. McCarty's lack of experience in the art of stump-speaking was well-known to most people, including the Democratic press. The statement issued by McCarty after the Whig State Convention that he would take no active part in the campaign gave

⁴⁴ *Indiana State Journal*, April 2, 1852.

occasion to the *Huntington Democrat* to express satisfaction with such a course. That paper said:

"It is understood that Mr. McCarty will remain at home throughout the entire campaign, being a little timorous about meeting Wright on the stump. That's a sensible arrangement on his part. For him to canvass the State in opposition to Jo. Wright would be only time and money thrown away, and it seems he knows it."⁴⁵

Expressions of this kind by the opposition served to draw Mr. McCarty from his retirement, as on March 16, he resigned his seat in the State Senate because

"his nomination as the Whig candidate for governor, and his determination to devote a considerable portion of his time in visiting different portions of the State, renders it necessary for him to resign."

The *Indiana State Journal*, throughout the campaign, manifested great confidence that the elections would result favorably to the Whigs. Soon after the opening of the State campaign, it expressed its confidence in the following words:

"There never has been a time in Indiana, since 1840, that the Whigs felt more confident of success than now. Since the news of the nominations made by the Whig Convention has reached the various parts of the State, we have received many letters of the most encouraging character. In every neighborhood the right kind of spirit to secure victory seems to pervade the Whig ranks."⁴⁶

The Whigs tried to make their prospects look a little more rosy by putting out rumors to the effect that many Democrats of Northern Indiana were so much displeased with the ticket composed mostly of Democrats from Southern Indiana that they would refuse to support it. The threat, if it was made, does not seem to have been carried out.

The Whigs and Democrats in many places in the State held jollification meetings following the news of their Presidential nominations, and at other times during the campaign. The press, in the period from April to November, carried an almost daily account of a ratification meeting or pole-raising somewhere in the State. Guns, bonfires, cannon and fire works were a few of the means to which the enthusiastic partisans resorted. Balloon ascensions, quite a novelty in that day, occurred at Indianapolis and Lafayette on the

⁴⁵ *Huntington Democrat*, March 15, 1852.

⁴⁶ *Indiana State Journal*, March 11, 1852.

occasion of jollification meetings. The newspapers of one party, in reporting an account of the meetings of the other party, always emphasized the poor attendance and conduct. On the other hand, when their own party held a meeting, the newspaper account dwells long on the enormous crowds that swarmed to hear the speaker, the number always taxing the capacity of the halls or grounds, and the great enthusiasm of everyone. A Democratic political meeting at Edinburg, on September 9, which was addressed by Thomas A. Hendricks, candidate for Congress, was reported by the Whig papers as having been postponed once because of the small audience, and when it did take place, there were only thirteen men and boys present. "About fifteen men and boys" was a favorite number with the Whig press when reporting Democratic meetings. The Democratic press was equally guilty of this practice. The papers frequently gave the speeches bitter and sarcastic criticisms.⁴⁷

In many instances, there were attempts, sometimes successful, made by rowdies of one party to disturb and to break up the political meetings of the other party. The practice was general and there were several cases of it in Indianapolis. But the most prominent case was that at New Albany just before election. The editor of the Democratic *Ledger*, John Norman, publicly accused the editor of the Whig New Albany *Tribune* of instigating the disturbance at the meeting held by the Democrats. The *Tribune* editor, P. M. Kent, did not deny the accusation, probably because he considered it as one of the legitimate tricks of the game. A great many voters of both parties had little interest in the campaign, so it may be that their conduct at political meetings was nothing more than horseplay.

The newspapers made good use of campaign poetry as a means of arousing enthusiasm and getting in an additional thrust at the enemy. Some of the poems were not of a very high class, but they all served the purpose.⁴⁸

The Free Soilers were most frequently troubled by having their

⁴⁷ *Indiana State Journal*, June 15, 1852. Hon. John W. Davis of Carlisle, Indiana, spoke to Democrats at Indianapolis June 14. *Journal*: "His speech lasted three-quarters of an hour, during which he completely enchanted the audience (judging from the absence of applause), glorified the 'gallant,' 'noble,' 'Young Hickory of the Granite State,' and gave the Whigs particular saltpeter."

⁴⁸ *Indiana State Sentinel*, Aug. 30, 1852. "Such kind of stuff is all the argument that Whigs can hunt up in favor of Nick McCarty. It is now going the rounds of the Whig press in the State."

"Let fools unite
And vote for Wright,
Just to support the party,

While those who know
A thing or two
Will go for Nick McCarty."

meetings disturbed or broken up. They carried on their campaign work mostly in connection with church activities. Andrew L. Robinson, Free Soil candidate for governor, who made speeches in Evansville, New Albany, Madison and other towns on the Kentucky border, without interruption or annoyance, according to the *New Albany Daily Ledger*, was not permitted to speak at Terre Haute, far away from any influence which slaveholders might be expected to wield.⁴⁹

VII. THE NATIONAL CAMPAIGN

The national campaign may be said to have opened soon after the national conventions were over. The Democratic *Empire* said that "the opening of the Presidential campaign on the Democratic side, calls vividly to mind the good old Jackson times." And then the *Indiana State Journal* pointedly remarked: "Perhaps it does—by contrast; just as a famine is apt to revive the memory of the feast."⁵⁰ There certainly was a famine of real Democratic enthusiasm when the campaign began, and concerning this apparent deficiency, the *State Journal* continued:

"The great lack of enthusiasm among the Democrats for their candidates is occasioned by their obscurity in public life. Few people anywhere, including Indiana, know anything about the candidates. So there is little room either for criticism or enthusiasm."

A most correct diagnosis of the situation! Then the *State Journal* quotes from the Charleston (S. C.) *Mercury*, as follows:

"When a party throws aside all its most distinguished men, the only men capable of giving consistency to its counsel and vigor to its movements—when it disowns its leaders and representatives, and for motives of temporary advantage, crowns with highest honors obscure men, it ceases, in any respectable sense, to be a party, and becomes a mere herd of spoilsmen. We have no ambition to labor in such a crowd."⁵¹

The *State Journal*, in giving its opinion of Pierce, first quoted General Pickett, one of the Democratic stumblers of Tennessee, who said: that "the Presidency should never be awarded to any man on account of eminent services," and then it adds, "if this be so, then have the Democracy been very fortunate in their selection."⁵¹

⁴⁹ *New Albany Daily Ledger*, Oct. 28, 1852.

⁵⁰ *Indiana State Journal*, June 25, 1852.

"Obscurity of Pierce," James Schouler, *History of the U. S.*, Vol. 5, Chap. XX, p. 244.

⁵¹ *Indiana State Journal*, Sept. 30, 1852.

The Whig newspapers of the State took great delight in the many mistakes which the Democrats made in reporting the name of their Presidential candidate. Lists of these errors were run in the Whig papers. Many of the names were given by the editors of the country newspapers who, not knowing the real name, made one of their own. Also, the Whigs invented some of the names for their own use. The *State Journal* conducted an unrelenting editorial attack against General Pierce up until the very day of the election. It did almost everything possible to belittle and heap ridicule upon the Democratic candidate. It made light of Pierce's war record, saying that:

"Next to making a 'whistle out of a pig's ear' the attempt at manufacturing Franklin Pierce, Attorney and Counselor at Law and Solicitor in Chancery, into a military hero, is the most provoking."

The Whigs worked hard to make capital of the fact that the New Hampshire constitution excluded Catholics from holding office and General Pierce was a member of the convention that drafted the constitution. They contended that the Democrats controlled the state and made the law; therefore that in the convention they were against the Catholics. General Pierce was in the convention, but there was plenty of proof to show that he opposed the provision relating to Catholic exclusion. In their turn, the Democrats often accused Scott of being a Catholic and a Catholic sympathizer, therefore the Native Whigs could not support him, nor could the Know-Nothings. This accusation was not well founded, as General Scott was an Episcopalian.

The Indiana Whigs began the national campaign by organizing Chippewa Clubs all over the State. The *Indiana State Journal* endorsed the idea of closer organization. These clubs usually conducted the Whig rallies and pole-raising.

On July 1st, the Whigs of Indianapolis had a great ratification meeting to endorse the nomination of the Whig National Convention. Resolutions were adopted which gave approval for the Scott and Graham nominations; for Fillmore's conduct in office and his good service; and expressing sorrow at the death of Henry Clay, an event which the *Indiana State Journal* called "a great national calamity, as creating a void in the councils of our country that can not be filled." Col. Henry S. Lane, of Montgomery county, made the main address. The Whigs declared that they had flourished

in 1840 on Hard Cider; in 1852 they would meet with equal success on Scott Soup and Graham Bread. On this occasion they raised a tall, thin pole bearing a Scott banner, but the pole soon broke, the event causing much amusement for the *State Sentinel*. The *State Journal* retorted that "any sapling will bear up the Pierce flag, for it is a name of no weight; but it takes something of a pole to float the great name of General Scott. Common timber won't do it." Music for the ratification meeting was furnished by the Chippewa Glee Club of the city.

The Whigs worked hard to make the tariff the leading issue of the campaign. While the Democrats were busy telling the voters the beneficent effects which the country was enjoying under the equitable Walker Tariff of 1846, they were engaged in reciting the iniquities of such half-hearted protection and loudly declared that the ruination of American industries was speedily being brought about. The *Indiana State Journal* carried a series of articles on tariff and protection which were intended to show the ill-effects of the Walker Tariff for revenue of 1846. They laid great emphasis on the decrease in foreign exportation and attendant increase in the amount of imports and the bad business conditions. They deplored the large shipments of specie sent from this country to Europe. This series of articles was signed by Americus of Philadelphia, Indiana, but the author was most likely O. H. Smith.

In the tariff controversy carried on during the campaign, the Whigs, in order to cite Democratic authority in the justification of protection, resurrected the old "Coleman letter," which General Jackson had written to Governor Ray, of Indiana, during his first administration. In this letter General Jackson had said that he favored a "judicious protection." The *State Journal* professed to believe and labored vigorously to make the voters believe that the Democrats, by free trade or low tariff, were sacrificing the American manufactures to the English merchants. It went so far as to declare that there was an alliance between the Locofoco party in the United States and the English merchants, to break down American manufactures and thus secure the market for England. The *State Journal* published items from three London papers purporting to show English preference for Pierce's success, though the truth was those papers expressed general indifference to the American election and stated that in event of General Pierce's success, the Democrats would continue to conduct commercial relations on the principle of

trade co-operation. The Whigs used this as another ruse to arouse opposition to the Democrats among the Irish by declaring that the Democracy was allied with England through free trade, which would not be for the welfare of Irishmen.

As the campaign was drawing to a close, the papers of both parties began to publish long lists of the names of voters who were not going to support their party nominees. The *New Albany Tribune* was the most notorious offender along this line. Many days its lists of "come-outers" from the Democratic party became so extensive that they were obliged to shorten the number for lack of space to print the names and frequently the *Tribune* editor would insert a statement to the effect that certain news items were postponed until the following day in order that in the issue at hand there might be space to publish the names of the Democrats who were flocking to support General Scott. The Democratic press was also guilty of using this method.⁵² Those voters who went from one party to the other were generally known as "backfirers," "come-outers," and their act was called "firing in the rear."

On September 11, the Democrats of Indianapolis had a grand rally with Judge Stephen A. Douglas, U. S. Senator from Illinois, as the chief orator of the day. Previous to the meeting, the Granite Clubs of the city, with most of the Democrats, had a procession which the *Indiana State Journal* reported as consisting of two carriages, and one buggy, the military company and just thirty-nine other persons, all told. The *State Journal* severely criticized Judge Douglas's speech and thereby aroused the ire of William J. Brown, the editor of the *Sentinel*. A few days later he flung a hot shot of the following calibre into the *Journal* camp:

"The *Journal* persists in its scurrilous abuse of Judge Douglas, and attempts to justify it. Though its course in this matter may be perfectly self-satisfactory, we are much mistaken if the correct taste and good sense of the decent portion of the Whig party is not outraged by such billingsgate."⁵³

⁵² *Indiana State Journal*, Aug. 28, 1852. "In 1840, and in 1848, the Democratic papers were filled with names of John Smiths and Jim Browns who would not vote for 'Old Granny Harrison' in 1840, and for 'Old Noodle-head Taylor' in 1848. The election day arrived, and we got along very well, without these gentlemen. The same trick is now being performed. Whole counties and even States of people won't go for 'Old Fuss and Feathers,' any way it can be fixed! Well, we shall see on election day. It will come out about as it did in 1840 and 1848."

⁵³ *Indiana State Journal*, Sept. 21, 1852.

Both parties made use to the fullest advantage of the war records of their candidates. The Democrats attacked General Scott for what they called his unjustifiable conduct in both the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. They even figured up the total amount of his salary which he had drawn from the government during forty years of service, and then they raised the howl for economy. The Whigs made light of Pierce's military record in Mexico, declaring that he fainted in battle at the sight of blood from a wound inflicted by falling from his horse. The Whigs thought that General Scott's long faithful and patriotic services to his country were in themselves, sufficient qualifications to fit him for the Presidency. His dealings with foreign-born citizens had been so extensive and varied, and his attitude on the period of naturalization required of immigrants had been so changeable that he was obliged to explain his position on the subject of naturalization in order to prevent the Democrats from making effective appeals to the foreign-born vote by circulating false stories as to his belief. Webster had few if any supporters in Indiana, or even the West; his strength was in the East. The defection of the Webster faction from the Whig regular ticket was denied by the Whig press of Indiana, but the papers from time to time, contained bitter expressions regarding Webster's attitude. His seventh of March speech had cost him the respect of most Northern Whigs.⁵⁴ Webster at no time was out of harmony with the Baltimore platform, but Whig leaders would not be reconciled because of his past acts and his refusal to participate in the campaign now. Even when news of Webster's death, on October 24, reached this State, the leading Whig papers of Indiana failed to show his memory the usual respect by wearing mourning, and they gave very little notice concerning his death. In contrast, the Democratic press accorded the noted statesman the customary respect of an opposition press, and the *New Albany Daily Ledger*, considered by many as the most liberal paper in the State, wore, on the morning following Webster's death, a full dress of mourning and carried a most praiseworthy eulogy of his life and services. The *Indiana State Journal*, the *New Albany Tribune* and other Whig papers passed him by with a wave of the hand, a few lines, a mere squib. The thoughts of the Whig editors were poorly concealed behind the veil of silence and the denial of the facts only helped to betray the true state of affairs within the Whig party.

⁵⁴ See J. G. Whittier's "Ichabod."

As soon as the campaign started, the campaign poets began to produce poetry of varying kinds, ranging from short battle-cries to long, romantic lyrics. All the newspapers were well supplied during the campaign with these literary efforts.⁵⁵

VIII THE ELECTIONS AND RESULTS

The State election was held October 12. The Democrats in several places accused the Whigs of using unfair means to promote their success. On the day preceding the election, the *New Albany Daily Ledger* gave strong exhortations to the Democrats to beware of fraudulent tickets on which the name of Mr. Willard, Democratic

⁵⁵ Here are a few samples of poetry:

WHIG WAR-CRY.

Damn the Locos,
Kill 'em—slay 'em!
Give 'em hell!
With Scott and Graham!
—N. A. *Daily Ledger*, Sept. 10, 1852.

FIRST DEMOCRATIC RALLYING SONG.

Fling forth our banner gallantly,
And let the people sing—
Hurrah for old Democracy—
Hurrah for Pierce and King.
Come brave Locos—
Gallant men and true,
The Whigs were Polked in '44
We'll Pierce in fifty-two.
—N. A. *Daily Ledger*, June 8, 1852.

A SONG FOR SCOTT AND GRAHAM.

In Baltimore the Whigs agreed
Upon their candidate;
And mean that he shall be the man
To guide the Ship of State.
He bears a name that is without
A blemish or a spot—
A patriot, hero, statesman, sage—
Who else but Winfield Scott.
Hie Lokies! Ho Lokies!
Listen while we sing,
Hurrah, hurrah, for noble Scott,
And down with Pierce and King.
—*Indiana State Journal*.

candidate for lieutenant-governor, had been replaced by the name of Mr. Williams, the Whig candidate for that office. The *Ledger* warned the Democrats to read carefully their ticket to see that every name was on it. This paper accused the Whig *Tribune* office of printing these tickets and Whig leaders of putting them into circulation. Other towns witnessed similar trouble from the use of mixed and scratched tickets, usually called fraudulent, but not technically so.⁵⁶

The returns for the election came in very slowly from the outlying parts of the State. By October 14, sufficient news as to the general trend had been received by the *Indiana State Journal* to bring it to the point of reluctantly admitting defeat. The *State Journal* had never had any great hopes that McCarty would be elected, as it admitted a few weeks before the election that it hardly expected McCarty to win, but was counting strongly on Scott to triumph. In the eleven congressional districts of the State, only one Whig was elected, the others being Democrats. These men were to take office in the first session of Congress in 1853. The last congressional election had been held in August, 1851, the men elected serving until the first session of 1853. This election was held according to the regulations of the old State constitution which became ineffective after 1851. The successful candidates in October, 1852, were as follows:

First District, Smith Miller; Second District, W. H. English; Third District, Cyrus L. Dunham; Fourth District, James H. Lane; Fifth District, Samuel W. Parker (Whig); Sixth District, Thomas A. Hendricks; Seventh District, John G. Davis; Eighth District, Daniel Mace; Ninth District, Norman Eddy; Tenth District, E. M. Chamberlain; Eleventh District, Andrew J. Harlan. Total—Democrats, 10; Whigs, 1.

The other State election returns are included in the same table with those of the National election. The *Indiana State Journal* ascribed this decisive defeat of its State ticket to the large numbers of foreigners in Indiana who voted the Democratic ticket, having been let in under the new Democratic State constitution of 1851.

⁵⁶ Each candidate had his own tickets printed. A straight ticket contained all the candidates of the party. If a voter so desired, he might have a man in another party insert his name on the ticket in place of the regular candidate. Tickets so altered and distributed indiscriminately without notice might carry the intent to defraud, but whether it was fraudulent depended entirely upon the voter.

In the preceding year more than four hundred Germans had settled in Marion county alone. The *State Journal* said the Whigs had the satisfaction of knowing that the better class of citizens voted the Whig ticket, to which the Peru *Sentinel*, Democratic, answered as follows:

"The *State Journal* man at Indianapolis has already commenced showing his true feelings toward our foreign population. In accounting for the recent overwhelming defeat of Whiggery in this State, he says the foreign vote is the cause. They (Whigs) have the consolation of knowing that all the better portion of our citizens voted the Whig ticket. If this view of the case affords him consolation, it would be cruel to disturb him in his agreeable fantasies."⁵⁷

The State election had scarcely passed by and the returns were not all in when the day of the National election approached. It was November 2. Indiana and even the whole Union appeared to have lost interest in the outcome. The voters were aware that an election was at hand, but they failed to manifest much understanding of the significance of the event. The political horizon was dimmed by few signs of an approaching tempest, few traces of the terrible breakers. There seemed nothing but a clear sky with all signs propitious to an era of peace and industrial development. There was scarcely a breath of political agitation, of any importance, stirring; everywhere was the calm, so quiet and oppressive that, only to the more discerning eye, it was evident that it could not long continue. Voters acquiesced with sullen silence in the conditions then existing and voted to continue such conditions. The Democrats solemnly declared the accomplishment of peace and prosperity to depend on the universal acquiescence in and recognition of the "finality"; for the Whigs, it all depended on the success of their party at the polls. The following quotation from the Logansport *Democratic Pharos*, on the eve of the national battle, well illustrates Democracy's position:

"The approaching presidential election is one of the deepest interest; and, indeed, it may be said without exaggeration, to be one of the most vitally important that ever has been held. It is not merely, as is alleged by some, to turn on a preference of men, or on a scramble for office, or mainly even on the issues which hitherto divided the parties; but it is to turn principally and really on the *finality* of the compromise, however much some may attempt to conceal the fact."⁵⁸

⁵⁷ *Indiana State Journal*, Oct. 29, 1852.

⁵⁸ *Logansport Democratic Pharos*, Oct. 27, 1852.

There is no doubt that the issue of "finality" did not influence some sections of the country, but it is true that there was somewhat of a scramble for office. The *State Journal*, on election day, recounted at considerable length the dire disasters which would befall the nation, in event of their opponents' triumph. It said:

"The result of the election today is of vast consequence to the future of this country. The triumph of the Democracy would see the destruction of the little protection now existing. Then would the spirit of conquest and lawlessness be fostered and encouraged until our country would be involved in war. Cuba would be seized upon and appropriated to our own use in defiance of existing treaty stipulations with Spain. Then would the slavery question, which so recently threatened to destroy our country, and is now so happily settled, be opened again, not to be closed otherwise than by a dissolution of the Union.⁵⁹

How true the *State Journal* spoke in the last sentence history alone has proven. The returns from the election came to the press very slowly. Two days after the election the *State Journal* had received enough of the results to bring the editor to admit defeat. The editor deeply regretted that the people put aside their famous hero for such an obscure individual as Pierce. The returns for the State and national elections were completed about a month afterward and published in the *Indiana State Journal*. The following table of returns shows the vote by counties for the presidential and gubernatorial candidates:⁶⁰

COUNTIES.	President.			Governor.		
	Pierce	Scott	Hale	Wright	McCarty	Robinson
Adams -----	672	362	14	652	329	4
Allen -----	1,964	1,225	24	1,804	963	11
Bartholomew -----	1,512	1,245	26	1,412	1,097	11
Benton -----	138	110	19	144	106	--
Blackford -----	263	108	15	340	110	8
Boone -----	1,161	936	109	1,113	919	27
Brown -----	532	102	--	606	120	--
Carrol -----	1,256	1,075	29	1,209	909	3
Cass -----	1,190	1,176	50	1,189	994	8
Clark -----	1,812	1,186	24	1,683	1,068	6
Clay -----	743	474	8	820	388	--
Clinton -----	1,250	929	75	1,180	841	--
Crawford -----	499	502	--	524	528	--
Daviess -----	720	726	6	795	549	--
Dearborn -----	2,486	1,474	89	2,436	1,477	15
Decatur -----	1,394	1,364	138	1,392	1,345	83
DeKalb -----	780	391	164	684	386	95
Delaware -----	937	1,083	11	892	991	3

⁵⁹ *Indiana State Journal*, Nov. 2, 1852.

⁶⁰ *Indiana State Journal*, Dec. 6, 1852.

COUNTIES.	President.			Governor.		
	Pierce	Scott	Hale	Wright	McCarty	Robinson
Dubois -----	717	229	--	883	206	--
Elkhart -----	1,343	1,068	28	1,271	873	--
Fayette -----	872	1,019	80	869	921	60
Floyd -----	1,815	1,328	1	1,851	1,260	3
Fountain -----	1,496	1,023	64	1,267	803	12
Franklin -----	1,956	1,473	30	1,973	1,413	11
Fulton -----	581	559	6	561	522	--
Gibson -----	1,127	942	20	1,020	842	--
Grant -----	836	599	345	925	712	199
Greene -----	944	884	4	1,048	785	--
Hamilton -----	961	971	401	893	952	293
Hancock -----	1,002	823	40	980	758	--
Harrison -----	1,278	1,284	--	1,155	1,158	--
Hendricks -----	980	1,252	156	925	1,223	23
Henry -----	1,226	1,559	456	1,179	1,527	358
Howard -----	526	539	165	465	516	88
Huntington -----	888	706	38	797	682	--
Jackson -----	1,188	614	--	1,088	484	10
Jasper -----	347	357	33	317	299	--
Jay -----	500	375	135	562	426	55
Jefferson -----	2,263	2,016	286	2,064	1,845	168
Jennings -----	1,104	998	59	1,037	954	13
Johnson -----	1,333	896	20	1,172	775	4
Knox -----	1,003	1,167	--	938	987	--
Kosciusko -----	938	1,045	26	919	1,000	16
LaGrange -----	677	677	117	746	709	--
Lake -----	334	230	58	465	228	--
Laporte -----	1,468	1,357	136	1,330	1,226	3
Lawrence -----	1,113	1,054	14	1,116	978	--
Madison -----	1,282	1,004	83	1,253	942	--
Marion -----	2,599	2,158	112	2,469	2,075	28
Marshall -----	511	343	56	508	322	18
Martin -----	519	377	5	621	235	--
Miami -----	1,196	994	76	1,139	924	--
Monroe -----	1,085	622	87	1,151	629	37
Montgomery -----	1,852	1,559	100	1,772	1,527	45
Morgan -----	1,181	1,109	132	1,158	1,169	5
Noble -----	807	606	79	779	587	25
Ohio -----	455	432	2	460	408	--
Orange -----	1,022	747	3	977	583	--
Owen -----	1,060	901	20	849	705	8
Parke -----	1,084	1,312	105	1,157	1,181	19
Perry -----	659	684	3	724	653	--
Pike -----	688	538	1	809	499	2
Porter -----	527	444	88	532	379	20
Posey -----	1,433	784	26	1,368	595	4
Pulaski -----	333	210	1	360	178	--
Putnam -----	1,466	1,712	22	1,418	1,449	--
Randolph -----	993	900	530	988	965	442
Ripley -----	1,386	1,119	113	1,466	1,183	72
Rush -----	1,480	1,507	119	1,406	1,466	51
Scott -----	559	518	11	586	505	9
Shelby -----	1,627	1,286	27	1,629	1,071	----
Spencer -----	710	685	1	757	577	24
Starke -----	122	66	----	144	51	----
Steuben -----	543	487	90	502	503	41
St. Joseph -----	1,052	998	174	979	928	122
Sullivan -----	1,203	529	----	1,188	399	----

Switzerland -----	1,147	1,134	7	1,098	979	----
Tippecanoe -----	2,446	1,918	143	1,912	1,471	77
Tipton -----	461	340	7	457	293	4
Union -----	626	584	149	611	576	86
Vanderburg -----	1,317	945	6	1,300	838	----
Vermillion -----	783	852	4	763	717	1
Vigo -----	1,155	1,694	8	1,112	1,350	----
Wabash -----	959	1,145	91	952	1,018	----
Warren -----	552	850	56	464	705	1
Warrick -----	1,034	487	31	1,056	435	16
Washington -----	1,613	1,093	11	1,576	939	2
Wayne -----	1,874	2,304	786	1,763	2,142	553
Wells -----	710	415	23	625	391	----
White -----	536	510	13	497	453	----
Whitely -----	568	497	11	550	462	1
Total -----	95,299	80,901	6,934	92,576	73,641	3,303

The vote for Hale and Julian was unexpectedly small, having decreased about one-fourth in Indiana since the preceding presidential election. This party, the Free Soil, had served its purpose and could no longer exist as a separate organization.

For the session of 1852-53, the Indiana State Legislature was composed as follows:

	Dem.	Whig.
Senate -----	34	16
House of Representatives -----	66	34

When the result was commonly known as a Democratic triumph, the Whig papers began their work as "calamity howlers," each for its own community predicting great evils to come upon the nation during the next administration. The *Indiana State Journal* started out two days after the election with the following:

"The forcible extension of slavery and the formation of a batch of slave States will again unchain the spirit of disunion and civil war. Such will be the legitimate result of the late election, and we say—let it come! We want to see the writhing of those who will have thus brought upon the country so terrible a scourge."

The editor was partly correct in his prediction.

The Democrats celebrated their victory in such a half-hearted manner that the Whigs expressed disappointment. The Democrats were neither surprised nor gratified at their success. They expected to carry the elections but probably never dreamed of the magnitude of their victory, which, great as it was, failed to arouse the old-time enthusiasm.

The election had resulted in a sweeping defeat of the Whig forces. The seriousness of the disaster was not immediately apparent, although some of the wise men in the party, like Greeley, and a few Democratic editors pretended to see the total dissolution of the Whig party at hand. The New Albany *Daily Ledger* was one of the Democratic papers which firmly believed that the Whig party had been killed and now would be superseded by a new party, the Seward-Abolition party. On November 16, the *Daily Ledger* carried the following article on the future of the Whig party, written by Horace Greeley for his New York *Tribune*:

"General Scott is overwhelmingly defeated, and the Whig party not merely discomfited but annihilated. We have no prophetic ken, and make no pretensions to reading the future; but we do not see how the Whig party as such can ever be rallied again. Defeat is but accidental, to which any party may be subjected; but a defeat based on comprehensive, systematic treachery, like that just experienced (through Fillmore and Webster), can hardly be other than conclusive."

After considering the effect which the election did have on the Whig party, the only conclusion is that Horace Greeley was right in his belief.

IX THE CONCLUSION

Democracy's triumph in 1852 was nothing more than a barren victory. The battle in Indiana had been fought listlessly and with little popular interest. Although there had been occasions when enthusiasm was displayed, yet the political meetings had lacked the life and spirit of the preceding campaigns. The spirit of a political campaign depends almost wholly upon the interest aroused in the issues. In this campaign the issues no longer deserved the name; they were dead, notwithstanding the efforts of the politicians to inject life into the "finality" question. The politicians fought over the carrion of extinct political questions; they fought for the offices, for there was little else at stake. Office was the real issue, and its cause was championed by Democrats and Whigs alike. Victory meant no triumph of political principles; instead, it carried with it this time only jobs for so many hungry aspirants. Voters went to the polls because they had to discharge a citizens' duty, not with the belief that their vote was needed to help onward some all-important issue.

The result of the elections this year, favorable as they were to the Democrats, was not an indication or proof that the Democrats

had made a glorious, aggressive fight against a worthy and valiant foe. The Democrats appeared to be united, but the Free Soil element of the party stayed away from the polls. The Whigs had had to fight disunion and sedition within their own ranks during the campaign, so they were in no condition to win from the Democratic hosts already strongly intrenched in the State offices and backed by well-organized party machinery. Occasionally there were heard, in those days, the complaints of the party masses against the bad practices of the machine politicians who were the men that forced the compromise legislation upon the people. The Democratic leaders were very successful in bringing their followers to believe that "finality" of the compromise legislation was absolutely necessary to the continued existence of the Union. Many Democrats considered that they were performing a patriotic service by voting to keep in office the political leaders who had enacted the compromise measures two years before. Others in this party were uninfluenced by the plea of the politicians. It is impossible to know what might have happened if there had been no general acquiescence in the finality; civil war then, instead of a decade later, might have resulted.

The campaign and election of 1852 marked the last important contest by the Whigs. The Jacksonian Democracy, likewise, made its final stand at this same time. Hereafter the Free Soil men, the Conscience Whigs and the Jacksonian Democrats were to be found fighting together for a common cause. Two short years intervened until a new political organization arose from the ashes of the old Whig party, a new organization which included almost all the leading Democratic editors of Indiana in its ranks. That element of Indiana Democracy, in the Northern part of the State, which complained because they were accorded such slight recognition in the selection of the Democratic State ticket, was ready to shift its support to any party that would treat it fairly. And that element of the Whig party which believed that its rights had been violated and its protests stifled by the Whig politicians during the Slavery controversy, gladly welcomed the opportunity for the political freedom offered by the new party. By the time another National election was at hand, these various elements were fighting side by side under the common banner of Republicanism. The most significant result of the election of 1852 was that it laid the foundations of a new political organization, the Republican party.